

OCT 18 2006

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 30-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 30 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 30.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 30 have been amended to clarify that: (i) a first packet includes a first header and a first payload; (ii) a second packet includes a second header and a second payload; (iii) the second header includes security context used to encrypt the second payload; (iv) the first payload includes the second packet; (v) a recipient computer system is associated with a first IP version compliant address (e.g., an IPv4 address); and (vi) a process executing on the recipient is associated with a second IP version compliant address (e.g., an IPv6 address). Support for the aforementioned amendments may be found, for example, in Figures 6 and 7 and accompanying text of the referenced application. Claim 36 is also amended to address an antecedent basis issue arising from the amendment of independent claim 30. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 2002/0073215 ("Huitema") and U.S. Patent Application Publication Serial No. 2002/00133608 ("Godwin"). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, requires, in part, (i) a first packet including a first header and a first payload; (ii) the first header including a first IP version compliant address (e.g., an IPv4 address) corresponding to a recipient computer; (iii) the first payload including a second packet; (iv) the second packet including a second header and second payload; and (v) the second header including a virtual address (within the security context), where the virtual address corresponds to a process on the recipient computer and the virtual address is a second IP version compliant address (e.g., an IPv6 address).

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (MPEP § 2143). The Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the cited references teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 1.

Specifically, Huitema teaches a system that is configured to receive IPv4 packets without an encapsulated IPv6 packet and IPv4 packets with encapsulated IPv6 packet. Upon receipt of an IPv4 packet, Huitema teaches a filter configured to determine whether the IPv4 packet includes an

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

encapsulated IPv6 packet. If the IPv4 packet includes an encapsulated IPv6 packet, then the IPv6 packet is extracted and sent to the corresponding IPv6 device (*i.e.*, the physical device with the IPv6 address). If the IPv4 packet does not include an encapsulated IPv6 packet, then the IPv4 packet is sent, without further processing, to the corresponding IPv4 device (*i.e.*, the physical device with the IPv4 address). (*see* Huitema, Figure 3 and 4 with accompanying text).

Further, Godwin is directed to using IPsec in a clustering computer environment. (*see* Goodwin, Figure 4). More specifically, Godwin teaches a method for sending data using IPsec between a number of different hosts (*i.e.*, physical devices) on a network. The aforementioned IPsec packets are communicated over the network using virtual addresses, where each virtual address is associated with a host. (*see* Godwin, [0033]-[0034]).

However, neither Huitema nor Godwin teach or suggest a first packet encapsulating a second packet, where the first packet includes a first IP version compliant address of a recipient computer and the second packet includes a second IP version compliant address of a process executing on the recipient computer. Rather, Huitema only teaches sending a packet to a recipient computer using an IPv4 or IPv6 address without any teaching or suggestion routing the packet to a process within the recipient computer using a second address. Further, Godwin only teaches sending a packet to a recipient computer using single virtual address without any teaching or suggestion of routing the packet within the recipient computer using another address. In fact, both Huitema and Godwin are completely silent with respect to performing any further routing of data within a computer once the data is received by the computer.

In view of the above, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Amended independent claim 30 includes at least the same patentable limitations as amended

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

independent claim 1 and, thus, is also patentable over the cited references. Finally, dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended independent claims 1 and 30. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Godwin in view of the article entitled "Mobile IPv6 Solution Based on the Linux NetFilter Framework" ("Gang"). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 37 depends indirectly from amended independent claim 30. As discussed above, Huitema and Godwin fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 30. Further, Gang does not teach that which Huitema and Godwin lack. Specifically, Gang is directed to Netfilter as it applies to IPv6 mobile implementations. However, Gang is completely silent with respect to performing any further routing of data within a computer once the data is received by the computer.

In view of the above, amended independent claim 30 is patentable over the cited references. Further, dependent claim 37 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 30. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159/035001).

Dated: October 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  ^{#20021}
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant